

Serial No. 09/975,312
Page 16 of 22

REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the non-final Office Action mailed July 26, 2007. In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that claims 1-64 are pending and rejected. By this response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 26, 29, 34, 42, 43, 59 and 63. Support for the amendments to the independent claims can be found in the Applicants' specification on at least page 69, lines 15-23.

In view of both the amendments presented above and the following discussion, Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, Applicants believe that all of the claims are now in allowable form.

It is to be understood that Applicants, by amending the claims, do not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to Applicants' subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, Applicants are not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the prior art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant response including amendments.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-64 UNDER 35 U.S.C §103

Claims 1-13, 15-33, 43-50, 52-54, 56, 57, and 59-64

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-13, 15-33, 43-50, 52-54, 56, 57, and 59-64 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosser (6,446,261, hereinafter "Rosser") in view of Kitsukawa et al. (6,282,713, hereinafter "Kitsukawa"). The rejection is traversed.

The test under 35 U.S.C. §103 is not whether an improvement or a use set forth in a patent would have been obvious or non-obvious; rather the test is whether the claimed invention, considered as a whole, would have been obvious. Thus, it is impermissible to focus either on the "gist" or "core" of the invention. Moreover, the invention as a whole is not restricted to the specific subject matter claimed, but also embraces its properties and the problem it solves.

Rosser and Kitsukawa alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest Applicants' invention of at least claim 1 as a whole.

Serial No. 09/975,312
Page 17 of 22

Independent claim 1 recites:

1. A method for targeting interactive virtual advertisements, comprising:
assigning at least one interactive spot to a program;
assigning one or more interactive virtual objects to the at least one virtual advertisement spot, wherein said one or more interactive virtual objects are dynamic;
generating a retrieval plan;
providing the retrieval plan to a terminal, wherein the retrieval plan instructs the terminals to select one of the one or more interactive virtual objects;
allocating delivery bandwidth for the selected one of the one or more interactive virtual objects via a resource management engine;
delivering the selected one of the one or more interactive virtual objects via said allocated delivery bandwidth;
receiving a selection of at least one of the one or more interactive virtual objects;
logging the received selection of said at least one of the one or more interactive virtual objects; and
billing an advertiser of said selected at least one of the one or more interactive virtual objects in response to said logged selection. (Emphasis added).

In an exemplary embodiment, the Applicants' invention teaches that the interactive virtual objects may be transmitted over any cable system for example a coaxial cable network, totally fiber network, hybrid fiber coax network, fiber to the curb network or any other cable distribution technology. (See e.g., Applicants' specification, p. 55, II. 1-2). Consequently, sufficient bandwidth must be allocated to deliver the interactive virtual objects. (See e.g., Applicants' specification, p. 28, II. 17-24). Furthermore, the Applicants' invention logs selection of interactive advertisements for billing an advertiser based upon the positive indication that an advertisement was actively viewed by a subscriber. (See *Id.* at p. 69, lines 15-23).

Nowhere in Rosser is there any teaching or suggestion of Applicants' method or system for targeting interactive virtual advertisements allocating delivery bandwidth for the selected one of the one or more interactive virtual objects via a resource management engine and billing an advertiser of said selected at least one of the one or more interactive virtual objects in response to said logged selection, as recited in at least claim 1. Rosser discloses a set top device for targeted electronic insertion of

Serial No. 09/975,312

Page 18 of 22

indicia into video. Rosser teaches that the advertising insertions are delivered via a vertical blanking interval (VBI). (See Rosser, col. 4, ll. 24-29.) Therefore, no allocation of delivery bandwidth is required because Rosser teaches that the advertising insertions may simply be inserted into space already available. In stark contrast, the Applicants' invention teaches that the interactive virtual objects are transmitted over cable systems. Thus, a resource management engine is required to allocate delivery bandwidth for the selected interactive virtual objects.

The Applicants note the Examiner's response that Rosser teaches that data may be transmitted in a variety of methods on column 6, lines 49-67. However, Rosser does not teach or suggest the positive action of "allocating" delivery bandwidth, as positively claimed by the Applicants' invention. For example, the Applicants' invention teaches that bandwidth may be assigned to virtual objects based on individual virtual object locations or multiple virtual object locations targeted to different groups. (See e.g., Applicants' specification, p. 28, ll. 17-24). In other words, given a limited amount of bandwidth a resource management engine must decide how to allocate bandwidth amongst the interactive virtual objects.

In stark contrast, Rosser does not teach how the data is allocated within the different delivery methods. For example, Rosser may simply insert the data into one of the delivery methods simply on a first in first out method. Therefore, Rosser does not teach or suggest allocating delivery bandwidth for the selected one of the one or more interactive virtual objects via a resource management engine. Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that contrary to the Examiner's assertion, a resource management engine is not an inherent feature. As such, the Applicants' respectfully submit that Rosser also fails to teach or suggest the use of a resource management engine.

Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Rosser also fails to teach or suggest billing an advertiser of said selected at least one of the one or more interactive virtual objects in response to said logged selection.

Kitsukawa fails to bridge the substantial gap between Rosser and Applicants' invention. In particular, Kitsukawa only teaches the use of static icons to represent links to advertisements for items in a scene. (See Kitsukawa, col. 8, ll. 16-36, FIG. 5.)

Serial No. 09/975,312
Page 19 of 22

Nowhere in Kitsukawa is there any teaching or suggestion of Applicants' invention of method or system for targeting interactive virtual advertisements allocating delivery bandwidth for the selected one of the one or more interactive virtual objects via a resource management engine and delivering the selected one of the one or more interactive virtual objects via said allocated delivery bandwidth, as recited in at least claim 1.

Therefore, Rosser and Kitsukawa, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest Applicants' invention of at least claim 1 as a whole. As such, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is not obvious over Rosser and Kitsukawa and is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Independent claims 6, 26, 43 and 59 recite relevant limitations similar to those recited in independent claim 1. As such, for at least the same reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that independent claims 6, 26, 43 and 59 also are not obvious and are patentable over Rosser and Kitsukawa under 35 U.S.C. §103. Furthermore claims 2-5, 7-13, 15-25, 27-33, 44-50, 52-54, 56, 57, and 60-64 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 26, 43 and 59 while adding additional elements. Therefore, these dependent claims also are not obvious and are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 for at least the same reasons discussed above in regards to independent claims 1, 26, 43 and 59. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 14

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosser and Kitsukawa as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Hendricks et al. (5,600,364, hereinafter "Hendricks") and Del Sesto et al. (6,530,082, hereinafter "Sesto"). The rejection is traversed.

This ground of rejection applies only to a dependent claim and is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 given Rosser in view of Kitsukawa for the corresponding independent claim. Since the rejection of the corresponding independent claim under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that Hendricks and DelSesto alone or in combination supply that which is missing from Rosser in view of

Serial No. 09/975,312
Page 20 of 22

Kitsukawa to render the independent claim obvious, this ground of rejection cannot be maintained. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 34-42

Claims 34-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosser in view of Kitsukawa and Zigmond et al. (6,698,020, hereinafter "Zigmond"). The rejection is traversed.

For at least the reasons discussed above in response to the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of independent claim 1, Rosser and Kitsukawa alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest Applicants' invention as a whole. In particular, Rosser and Kitsukawa alone or in combination are devoid of any teaching or suggestion of Applicants' invention of a terminal for targeting interactive virtual objects comprising a connector that receives the interactive virtual objects and interactive virtual object locations and metadata via delivery bandwidth allocated by a resource management engine and a computer readable memory for logging a received selection of at least one of the interactive virtual objects, wherein said logged selection is used for billing an advertiser of said selected at least one of the interactive virtual objects, as recited in at least claim 34.

Zigmond fails to bridge the substantial gap between Rosser and Kitsukawa and Applicants' invention. Zigmond only teaches techniques for intelligent video ad insertion. (See Zigmond, Abstract). Zigmond also fails to teach or suggest the use of a connector that receives the interactive virtual objects and interactive virtual object locations and metadata via delivery bandwidth allocated by a resource management engine and a computer readable memory for logging a received selection of at least one of the interactive virtual objects, wherein said logged selection is used for billing an advertiser of said selected at least one of the interactive virtual objects.

As such, Applicants submit that independent claim 34 is not obvious and is patentable over Rosser in view of Kitsukawa and Zigmond under 35 U.S.C. §103. Furthermore claims 35-42 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 34 while adding additional elements. Therefore, these dependent claims also are not obvious and are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 for at least the same reasons discussed

Serial No. 09/975,312
Page 21 of 22

above in regards to independent claim 34. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 51

Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosser and Kitsukawa as applied to claim 50 above, and further in view of DelSesto. The rejection is traversed.

This ground of rejection applies only to a dependent claim and is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 given Rosser in view of Kitsukawa for the corresponding independent claim. Since the rejection of the corresponding independent claim under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that DelSesto supplies that which is missing from Rosser in view of Kitsukawa to render the independent claim obvious, this ground of rejection cannot be maintained. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 55 and 58

Claims 55 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosser and Kitsukawa as applied to claims 43 and 54 above, and further in view of Zigmond. The rejection is traversed.

This ground of rejection applies only to dependent claims and is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 given Rosser in view of Kitsukawa for the corresponding independent claim. Since the rejection of the corresponding independent claim under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that Zigmond supplies that which is missing from Rosser in view of Kitsukawa to render the independent claim obvious, this ground of rejection cannot be maintained. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Serial No. 09/975,312
Page 22 of 22

CONCLUSION

Thus, Applicants submit that none of the claims, presently in the application, are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall or Jimmy Kim, at (732) 530-9404, so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/25/07

EJ Wall

Eamon J. Wall
Registration No. 39,414
Attorney for Applicant(s)

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
Telephone: 732-530-9404
Facsimile: 732-530-9808